# United States District Court

for the Southern District of Florida

United States of America	)
v.	)
	) Case No. 24-CR-20110-GAYLES(s)
FAUSTO R. VILLAR	)
Defendant	)

### ORDER OF DETENTION PENDING TRIAL

# Part I – Eligibility for Detention

Upon the

- ☑ Motion of the Government attorney pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(1), or
- ✓ Motion of the Government or Court's own motion pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(2),

the Court held a detention hearing and found that detention is warranted. This order sets forth the Court's findings of fact and conclusions of law, as required by 18 U.S.C. § 3142(i), in addition to any other findings made at the hearing.

## Part II – Findings of Fact and Law as to Presumptions under § 3142(e)

- ☑ A. Rebuttable Presumption Arises Under 18 U.S.C. § 3142(e)(2) (previous violator): There is a rebuttable presumption that no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the safety of any other person and the community because the following conditions have been met:
  - ☑ (1) the defendant is charged with one of the following crimes described in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(1):

    - ☑ (b) an offense for which the maximum sentence is life imprisonment or death; or
    - □ (c) an offense for which a maximum term of imprisonment of 10 years or more is prescribed in the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. §§ 801-904), the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. §§ 951-971), or Chapter 705 of Title 46, U.S.C. (46 U.S.C. §§ 70501-70508); or
    - □ (d) any felony if such person has been convicted of two or more offenses described in subparagraphs (a) through (c) of this paragraph, or two or more State or local offenses that would have been offenses described in subparagraphs (a) through (c) of this paragraph if a circumstance giving rise to Federal jurisdiction had existed, or a combination of such offenses; or
    - (e) any felony that is not otherwise a crime of violence but involves: (i) a minor victim; (ii) the possession of a firearm or destructive device (as defined in 18 U.S.C. § 921); (iii) any other dangerous weapon; or (iv) a failure to register under 18 U.S.C. § 2250; and
  - □ (2) the defendant has previously been convicted of a Federal offense that is described in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(1), or of a State or local offense that would have been such an offense if a circumstance giving rise to Federal jurisdiction had existed; *and*
  - □ (3) the offense described in paragraph (2) above for which the defendant has been convicted was committed while the defendant was on release pending trial for a Federal, State, or local offense; *and*
  - □ (4) a period of not more than five years has elapsed since the date of conviction, or the release of the defendant from imprisonment, for the offense described in paragraph (2) above, whichever is later.

☑ B. Rebuttable Presumption Arises Under 18 U.S.C. § 3142(e)(3) (narcotics, firearm, other offenses): There is a rebutta	
presumption that no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the appearance of the defendance as required and the safety of the community because there is probable cause to believe that the defendant commit one or more of the following offenses:	
☐ (1) an offense for which a maximum term of imprisonment of 10 years or more is prescribed in the Control Substances Act (21 U.S.C. §§ 801-904), the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. 951-971), or Chapter 705 of Title 46, U.S.C. (46 U.S.C. §§ 70501-70508);	
<b>☒</b> (2) an offense under 18 U.S.C. §§ 924(c), 956(a), or 2332b;	
☐ (3) an offense listed in 18 U.S.C. § 2332b(g)(5)(B) for which a maximum term of imprisonment of 10 years or more is prescribed;	ars
☐ (4) an offense under Chapter 77 of Title 18, U.S.C. (18 U.S.C. §§ 1581-1597) for which a maximum term imprisonment of 20 years or more is prescribed; or	ı of
☐ (5) an offense involving a minor victim under 18 U.S.C. §§ 1201, 1591, 2241, 2242, 2244(a)(1), 2245, 22 2251A, 2252(a)(1), 2252(a)(2), 2252(a)(3), 2252A(a)(1), 2252A(a)(2), 2252A(a)(3), 2252A(a)(4), 22 2421, 2422, 2423, or 2425.	
☑ C. Conclusions Regarding Applicability of Any Presumption Established Above	
☐ The defendant has not introduced sufficient evidence to rebut the presumption above.  OR	
☐ The defendant has presented evidence sufficient to rebut the presumption, but after considering presumption and the other factors discussed below, detention is warranted.	the
Part III – Analysis and Statement of the Reasons for Detention	
After considering the factors set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(g) and the information presented at the detention hearing the Court concludes that the defendant must be detained pending trial because the Government has proven:	ing,
☑ By clear and convincing evidence that no condition or combination of conditions of release will reasonably assure safety of any other person and the community.	the
☑ By a preponderance of evidence that no condition or combination of conditions of release will reasonably assure defendant's appearance as required.	the
In addition to any findings made on the record at the hearing, the reasons for detention include the following:	
☑ Weight of evidence against the defendant is strong	
☑ Subject to lengthy period of incarceration if convicted	
☑ Prior criminal history	
☐ Participation in criminal activity while on probation, parole, or supervision	
☐ History of alcohol or substance abuse	
☐ Lack of stable employment	
☐ Lack of stable residence	
☐ Lack of financially responsible sureties	
☐ Lack of significant community or family ties to this district	
☑ Significant family or other ties outside the United States	

☐ Subject to removal or deportation after serving any period of incarceration
☐ Prior failure to appear in court as ordered
$\square$ Prior attempt(s) to evade law enforcement
☐ Use of alias(es) or false documents
☐ Background information unknown or unverified
☐ Prior violations of probation, parole, or supervised release

#### OTHER REASONS OR FURTHER EXPLANATION:

After receiving evidence during the detention hearing held on Friday, August 9, 2024, which included a factual proffer provided by the Government with Special Agent Conor Goepel of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, available for cross examination, and considering all of the relevant factors, the Court makes three separate findings:

First, as to the danger to the community that the Defendant presents, the Court finds that the following factors lead it to find by clear and convincing evidence that no condition or combination of conditions could reasonably assure the safety of the community: (1) the circumstances of the offense, which include a murder for hire plot culminating in the brandishing of a firearm at a second victim, (2) the strength of the evidence, which included the Defendant's own conversation about obstructing the investigation, (3) the Defendant's prior violent history, which includes an armed robbery conviction in which the Defendant used a taser, and (4) the sentencing exposure the Defendant faces in this case, which includes a Sentencing Guidelines range of 135-168 months without acceptance of responsibility and 97-121 months with acceptance of responsibility consecutive to a seven year mandatory minimum sentence.

Second, as to the risk of nonappearance the Defendant presents, the Court finds that the following factors lead it to find by a preponderance of the evidence that no condition or combination of conditions could reasonably assure the Defendant's appearance in court: (1) the Defendant's ties to several countries around the world, (2) the Defendant's extensive international travel during the last three years, (3) the Defendant's own statements from a recorded call that he is "going dark," "zero dark thirty," and "I'm not going back to prison," and (4) the sentencing exposure the Defendant faces in this case, which includes a Sentencing Guidelines range of 135-168 months without acceptance of responsibility and 97-121 months with acceptance of responsibility consecutive to a seven year mandatory minimum sentence.

Third, the Defendant demonstrated an intent to obstruct justice through the destruction of evidence demonstrated by him telling another involved individual on a recorded call to "delete, delete," and "delete Instagram" among other instructions.

Therefore, the Defendant is remanded to the custody of the Attorney General or to the Attorney General's designated representative for confinement in a corrections facility. The Defendant must be afforded a reasonable opportunity for private consultation with defense counsel. On order of a court of the United States or on request of an attorney for the Government, the person in charge of the corrections facility must deliver the defendant to a United States Marshal for the purpose of an appearance in connection with a court proceeding.

Date: 8/12/2024 United States Magistrate Judge